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#### Capitalism manifests itself in democratic deliberation – free speech translates to a marketplace of ideas that propagates a system of capitalism. BROWN 15

[Brown, Wendy. Undoing the demos: Neoliberalism's stealth revolution. MIT Press, 2015]

At times, kennedy raises the pitch in Citizens United to depict limits on corporate funding of PAC ads as “an outright ban on speech”;19 at other times, he casts them merely as inappropriate government inter- vention and bureaucratic weightiness.20 But beneath all the hyperbole about government’s chilling of corporate speech is a crucial rhetorical move: the figuring of speech as analogous to capital in “the political marketplace.” on the one hand, government intervention is featured throughout the opinion as harmful to the marketplace of ideas that speech generates.21 Government restrictions damage freedom of speech just as they damage all freedoms. on the other hand, the unfettered accumulation and circulation of speech is cast as an unqual- ified good, essential to “the right of citizens to inquire...hear... speak...and use information to reach consensus [itself] a precondi- tion to enlightened self-government and a necessary means to protect it.”22 not merely corporate rights, then, but democracy as a whole is at stake in the move to deregulate speech. Importantly, however, democracy is here conceived as a marketplace whose goods—ideas, opinions, and ultimately, votes—are generated by speech, just as the economic market features goods generated by capital. In other words, at the very moment that Justice kennedy deems disproportionate wealth irrele- vant to the equal rights exercised in this marketplace and the utili- tarian maximization these rights generate, speech itself acquires the status of capital, and a premium is placed on its unrestricted sources and unimpeded flow.¶ What is significant about rendering speech as capital? economization of the political occurs not through the mere application of market principles to nonmarket fields, but through the conversion of political processes, subjects, categories, and principles to economic ones. This is the conversion that occurs on every page of the kennedy opinion. If everything in the world is a market, and neoliberal markets con- sist only of competing capitals large and small, and speech is the capital of the electoral market, then speech will necessarily share capital’s attributes: it appreciates through calculated investment, and it advances the position of its bearer or owner. Put the other way around, once speech is rendered as the capital of the electoral marketplace, it is appropriately unrestricted and unregulated, fungible across actors and venues, and existing solely for the advancement or enhancement of its bearer’s interests. The classic associations of political speech with freedom, conscience, deliberation, and persuasion are nowhere in sight.¶ How, precisely, is speech capital in the kennedy opinion? How does it come to be figured in economic terms where its regulation or restriction appears as bad for its particular marketplace and where its monopolization by corporations appears as that which is good for all? The transmogrification of speech into capital occurs on a number of levels in kennedy’s account. First, speech is like capital in its tendency to proliferate and circu- late, to push past barriers, to circumvent laws and other restrictions, indeed, to spite efforts at intervention or suppression.23 speech is thus rendered as a force both natural and good, one that can be wrongly impeded and encumbered, but never quashed.¶ second, persons are not merely producers, but consumers of speech, and government interference is a menace—wrong in prin- ciple and harmful in effect—at both ends. The marketplace of ideas, kennedy repeats tirelessly, is what decides the value of speech claims. every citizen must judge the content of speech for himself or herself; it cannot be a matter for government determination, just as govern- ment should not usurp other consumer choices.24 In this discussion, kennedy makes no mention of shared deliberation or judgment in politics or of voices that are unfunded and relatively powerless. He is focused on the wrong of government “command[ing] where a per- son may get his or her information or what distrusted source he or she may not hear, [using] censorship to control thought.”25 If speech generates goods consumed according to individual choice, government distorts this market by “banning the political speech of millions of associations of citizens” (that is, corporations) and by paternal- istically limiting what consumers may know or consider. Again, if speech is the capital of the political marketplace, then we are politically free when it circulates freely. And it circulates freely only when corporations are not restricted in what speech they may fund or promulgate.¶ Third, kennedy casts speech not as a medium for expression or dialogue, but rather as innovative and productive, just as capital is. There is “a creative dynamic inherent in the concept of free expres- sion” that intersects in a lively way with “rapid changes in technol- ogy” to generate the public good.26 This aspect of speech, kennedy argues, specifically “counsel[s] against upholding a law that restricts political speech in certain media or by certain speakers.”27 Again, the dynamism, innovativeness, and generativity of speech, like that of all capital, is dampened by government intervention.¶ Fourth, and perhaps most important in establishing speech as the capital of the electoral marketplace, kennedy sets the power of speech and the power of government in direct and zero-sum-game opposition to one another. Repeatedly across the lengthy opinion for the majority, he identifies speech with freedom and government with control, cen- sorship, paternalism, and repression.28 When free speech and govern- ment meet, it is to contest one another: the right of speech enshrined in the First Amendment, he argues, is “premised on mistrust of gov- ernmental power” and is “an essential mechanism of democracy [because] it is the means to hold officials accountable to the people.”29 Here are other variations on this theme in the opinion:¶ The First Amendment was certainly not understood [by the framers] to condone the suppression of political speech in society’s most salient media. It was understood as a response to the repression of speech.30¶ When Government seeks to use its full power, including criminal law, to command where a person may get his or her information or what distrusted source he or she may not hear, it uses censorship to control thought.... The First Amendment confirms the freedom to think for ourselves.31 This reading of the First Amendment and of the purpose of political speech positions government and speech as warring forces parallel to those of government and capital in a neoliberal economy.

#### Cap turns the case – it results in commodification, killing value to life – especially targets the lower class. SMITH 14:

R.C. Smith April 24, 2014 “POWER, CAPITAL & THE RISE OF THE MASS SURVEILLANCE STATE: ON THE ABSENCE OF DEMOCRACY, ETHICS, DISENCHANTMENT & CRITICAL THEORY” Heathwood Institute and Press.

One pressing issue, moreover, is that majority of the popular movements that have emerged in response to the Snowden leaks appear to be reformist in character. As a result, the discourse isn’t so much about fundamental system change; rather it becomes crafted into making mass surveillance less repulsive and more socially acceptable, even marketable. (Consider, for instance, the latest reforms proposed by President Barack Obama). For Adorno, this reformist inclination can be explained in part through an analysis of the logic of the system of capital. We read in Adorno how under modernity – i.e., capitalism – human beings are treated as commodities[4] and the political-economy, which is principled on concentrations of power (i.e., ‘contradictory recognition’[5]), goes over the head of the individual, particularly as ‘coercive society’ aims to ‘shape people’ on behalf of the economic, social and political status quo.[6] The system of capital, along with the instrumental use of Enlightenment ideals to promote a rational, efficient system[7] have laid a foundation for society wherein the political-economy influences individuals and manufactures **consent**.[8] Accordingly, people are seen as “substitutable entities valued merely for their instrumental uses or ability to command market resources,” and even where “commodification is resisted, the overriding pull of society is toward the status quo and those forms that are valued by society”. [9] As Kate Schick writes: The mind thus shapes itself into socially acceptable, marketable forms and freedom becomes an illusion, made all the more dangerous and difficult to resist because of the appearance of freedom. This is not the fault of Enlightenment ideals as such, but the instrumental use of these ideals in the promotion of a rational, efficient system: ‘The network of the whole is drawn ever tighter, modelled after the act of exchange’ (Adorno 1981: 21).[10] Present in the logic of the system of capital itself is not an ‘emancipatory reason’ that aims toward universal guiding principles of an actually egalitarian democracy – i.e., Equality, Egalitarianism, Justice, Rights, etc. Rather, in modern capitalism, with its instrumental reason and positivist logic, such concepts lose their meaning.[11] The social narrative no longer accommodates these fundamental principles or judges them to be delusions, because all concepts must be strictly functional in order to be considered “reasonable”.[12] In turn, the ideals of a ‘good’ society, for example ideals toward an actual egalitarian democracy, become dependent on the “interests” of the dominant and governing system, which produces and reproduces the epistemic context of its own validity.[13]

#### The alternative is to reject the violence inherent in the capitalist ideology – an interrogation on the ideology of the manifestation of capital is the only method. ZIZEK AND DALY:

Zizek and Daly 04- (Glyn Senior Lecturer in Politics at University College in Northampton, Slajov Slavoj Žižek is a Slovenian Marxist philosopher, psychoanalyst and cultural critic. He is a senior researcher at the Institute for Sociology and Philosophy, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia “Conversations with Zizek”, p. 14-16) GHSGB

For Zizek **it is imperative that we cut through this** Gordian **knot of postmodern protocol and recognize that our ethico-political responsibility is to confront the constitutive violence of today’s global capitalism and its obscene naturalization** / anonymization of the millions who are subjugated by it throughout the world. […] [Full text available] In this way, **neo-liberal ideology attempts to naturalize[s] capitalism by presenting its outcomes of winning and losing as if they were simply a matter of chance and sound judgment in a neutral market place. Capitalism** does indeed **create[s] a space for a certain diversity**, at least for the central capitalist regions, **but it is neither neutral nor ideal and its price in terms of social exclusion is exorbitant.** That is to say, **the human cost in terms of inherent global poverty and degraded ‘life-chances’ cannot be calculated within the existing economic rationale and**, in consequence, **social exclusion remains mystified and nameless** (viz. the patronizing reference to the ‘developing world’). And Zizek’s point is that **this mystification is magnified through capitalism’s profound capacity to ingest its own excesses and negativity: to redirect** (or misdirect) **social antagonisms and to absorb them within a culture of differential affirmation.**

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater who best resists capitalism. Knowledge is commodified and instrumentalized so it can be distributed according to race and class while thoughts turn to propaganda. MCLAREN 01:

McLaren, Peter, and Ramin Farahmandpur. "Teaching against globalization and the new imperialism: Toward a revolutionary pedagogy." Journal of Teacher Education 52.2 (2001): 136-150.

THE PRIVATIZATION AND COMMERCIALIZATION OF PUBLIC EDUCATION Examining education policies within the context of economic globalization and neoliberalism raises a number of critical questions that include the following: What are some of the effects of globalization on public schools and public education? To what extent is the content of teaching and curriculum under the perilous influence of the shifting social, economic, and political relations within global capitalism? Spring (1998) identifies a key paradox that frames education and economic policies pursued in the United States and other advanced capital societies. First, education under globalization is viewed as a vehicle that assists the growing market economy. For many developing **countries**, an educated and skilled workforce ostensibly would mean higher levels of productivity and economic development. Second, education is viewed as a tool in solving problems associated with economic globalization such as unemployment and poverty. If, however, the market economy (by means of the capitalist law of value) is itself the cause of social and economic inequality, then it would appear a contradiction in terms to argue that the goal of education should be to assist in the expansion of the market economy (Spring, 1998). Economic globalization has not only failed to provide political stability and social and economic equality for many nations around the world, but it has also led to deepening social and economic polarization. Willie Thompson (1997) notes, Marx’s insights into the nature of capital’s reproduction and accumulation have never been bettered or displaced: his prevision of its future was extraordinarily percipient and impressively fulfilled. He was never a better prophet than when he insisted that capitalism was hastening towards its unavoidable destruction, that its internal forces carried it in a certain identifiable direction, which (contra Keynes) cannot be reversed or evaded. What capital produces above all is its own gravediggers. Marx meant the working class, and he was mistaken. What looks more likely to be capitalism’s executioner is capitalism itself—the problem is that everything else is practically certain to be entombed with it. (p. 224) As the logic of capital accumulation is shifting toward knowledge-based economies and as newforms of computer technology and biotechnology are being integrated into today’s hightech economy, information itself is fast becoming a high-priced new commodity. Transnational corporations are laboring vigorously to **privatize the socially produced knowledge associated with the educational system. Decreased government funding of public education has forced an unholy partnership with private corporations** who are seeking to create “high-tech knowledge industries” (Witheford, 1997). Transnational corporations are sponsoring research centers in universities across the United States by donating millions of dollars for the research, development, and production of for-profit technologies. This has resulted in the “high-tech colonization of education,” tr**ansforming public universities into corporate-operated “techopolises” that** have little interest in coexistence with the poor (**Witheford**, 1997). Under the command of the market economy, not even universities, colleges, and vocational schools are immune from the economic policies favoring capital accumulation. Niemark (1999) reports that the increasing social policies that support for-profit universities have made higher education an extension of the market economy. She writes that social policies that support privatization have moved in the direction of establishing for-profit degree-granting institutions (such as the University of Phoenix); outsourcing curriculum, instruction, counseling, operations, and administration (in such areas as bookstores, food services, libraries, computer operations, plant maintenance, security, printing, and payroll); signing campus-corporate research and development partnership and licensing agreements; and selling exclusive on-campus marketing rights to companies that sell products as varied as soft drinks, fast food, computers, and credit and telephone calling cards. The campus is becoming virtually indistinguishable from the marketplace, and both universities and their faculties are becoming entrepreneurs. (p. 24) The restructuring of higher education can clearly be seen as reinforcing class inequality and exposing public higher education to social and economic policies governed by the laws of the market economy (i.e., commodification, proletarianization, and capital accumulation). It also visibly functions as an impediment to the education and active participation of citizens in a democratic decision-making process dedicated to coexistence (Niemark, 1999). The shift toward the privatization and corporatization of public education is best exemplified by the corporate raider Michael Milken, the Wall Street wizard and junk bond king of the mid-1980s who deceptively swindled millions of dollars by luring investors into highrisk investment schemes. Milken has returned to the business world, this time by focusing on the lucrative $800 billion education market and has decided to create for-profit education enterprises with the help of his powerful—yet comparatively obscure—$500 million company known as Knowledge Universe. Milken has invested heavily in several companies producing educational materials. Knowledge Universe owns companies such as Children’s Discovery Centers, Bookman Testing Services, Pyramid Imaging Inc., Nobel Education Dynamics, and Leapfrog, which produces educational tools used at learning centers of the Riordan Foundation (Vrana, 1998). In a recent interview with the Los Angeles Times, Milken calculated that if the net worth of the United States is placed at $120 trillion, roughly $75 trillion consists of human capital. This means that every American is worth $400,000 to $500,000 (Vrana, 1998). In short, Milken has discovered that the knowledge business is a profitable commodity. Recent attempts by corporations to influence policy and curriculum decisions in urban schools abound. According to Kalle Lasn (1999), Corporate advertising (or is it the commercial media?) is the largest psychological project ever undertaken by the human race. Yet for all of that, its impact on us remains unknown and largely ignored. When I think of the media’s influence over years, over decades, I think of those brainwashing experiments conducted by Dr. Ewen Cameron in a Montreal psy-chiatric hospital in the 1950s. The idea of the CIA sponsored “depatterning” experiment was to outfit conscious, unconscious or semiconscious subjects with headphones, and flood their brain with thousands of repetitive “driving” messages that would alter their behavior over time. Sound familiar? Advertising aims to do the same thing. Dr. Cameron’s guinea pigs emerged from the Montreal trials with serious psychological damage. It was a great scandal. But no one is saying boo about the ongoing experiment of mass media advertising. In fact, new guinea pigs voluntarily come on board every day. (p. 19) It is not unusual these days to see school buses in certain states covered with advertisements for Burger King and Wendy’s fast food chain restaurants. It has become fashionable for elementary school children to carry books wrapped in free book covers plastered with ads for Kellogg’s Pop Tarts and Fox TV personalities. School districts have gleefully granted Coca-Cola and Pepsi exclusive contracts to sell their products in schools. In health education classes, students are taught nutrition by the Hershey Corporation in a scheme that includes a discussion of the important place of chocolate in a balanced diet. A classroom business course teaches students to value work by exploring how McDonald’s restaurants are operated and what skills are needed to become a successful McDonald’s manager and provides instructions on how to apply for a job at McDonald’s. Ecological and environmental education now involves students learning ecology from a Life of an Ant poster sponsored by Skittles candy and an environmental curriculum video produced by Shell Oil that concentrates on the virtues of the external combustion engine. Finally, a new company called Zap Me! lures schools into accepting thousands of dollars worth of computer equipment, including a satellite dish, 15 top-level personal computers, a furnished computer lab and high-speed Internet access in return for a constant display of on-screen advertisements in the lower left-hand corner of the screen (see Fischman & McLaren, 2000). Lasn (1999) writes, Your kids watch Pepsi and Snickers ads in the classroom (The school has made the devil’s bargain of accepting free audiovisual equipment in exchange for airing these ads on “Channel One”). . . . Administrators in a Texas school district announce plans to boost revenues by selling ad space on the roofs of the district’s seventeen schools—arresting the attention of the fifty-eight million commercial jet passengers whofly into Dallas each year. Kids tattoo their calves with swooshes. Other kids, at raves, begin wearing actual bar codes that other kids can scan, revealing messages such as “I’d like to sleep with you.” . . . A few years ago, marketers began installing ad boards in men’s washrooms on college campuses, at eye level above the urinals. From their perspective, it was a brilliant coup: Where else is a guy going to look? But when I first heard this was being done, I was incensed. One of the last private acts was being co-opted. (pp. 19-21) A math book published by McGraw-Hill is spiked with references to Nike, Gatorade, Disney, McDonald’s, Nabisco, Mattel Barbie dolls, Sony play stations, Cocoa Frosted Flakes, Spalding basketballs and Topps baseball cards (Collins & Yeskel, 2000, p. 78). John Borowski, a public school teacher, recently noted in The New York Times, At least 234 corporations are now flooding the public schools with films, textbooks and computer software under the guise of “instructional material.” A lesson in self-esteem sponsored by Revlon includes an investigation of “good and bad hair days.” In a history lesson, Tootsie Rolls are touted as a part of soldiers’ diets during WorldWar II. Exxon provides a video on the Valdez spill playing down its ecological impact. And Chevron, in a lesson for use in civics science classes, reminds students that they will soon be able to vote and make “important decisions” about global warming, which the company then rebuts as incomplete science. (The New York Times, 1999, p. A23) Another example of corporatism in schools is Channel One, a commercially produced news station that now operates in many American schools. As part of a contractual agreement, teachers agree to broadcast Channel One programs in class for 10 minutes a day in return for a satellite dish, video cassette recorders, and as many television sets as they want. A study of its effects revealed that the students were no better informed than their contemporaries but that the advertisements broadcast on the channel had a significant effect on their consumer tastes (Aitkenhead, cited in Cole, 1998, p. 327). On one hand, schools do contribute to the ideals of democratic organizations (in terms of providing access to relevant knowledge and equal opportunities). On the other hand, schools operate at the same time in sustaining and reinforcing the logic of capitalism by functioning as a reproductive force that offers different and unequal kinds of knowledge and rewards based on class, gender, and race (McLaren, 1997). Here we see inequality as having to do with how society regulates the distribution of different types of capital. Perrucci and Wysong (1999) describe these as consumption capital (having to do with wages or salary), investment capital (having to do with a surplus of consumption capital that you can invest and on which you can earn interest), skills capital (having to do with specialized knowledge that people accumulate through their work experience, training, or education), and social capital (having to do with the network of social ties that people have to family, friends, and acquaintances, as well as the collectively owned economic and cultural capital of a group). Educators have long made the case that schools traffic in cultural capital (values, attitudes, dress, mannerisms, personal style, etc.) (McLaren, 1997), but they have rarely linked the production of cultural capital to the international division of labor brought about by uneven development.